

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-29 are pending.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-19, 23-26 and 28-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lemmons et al U.S. Patent No. 5,880,768 ("Lemmons").

Claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemmons in view of Lawler et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,805,763 ("Lawler").

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

III. Applicants' Reply to the § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-19, 23-26 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lemmons. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in independent claims 1 and 15, is directed to a method and system for displaying television program listings on a screen. The television program listings are displayed as a grid of two-dimensional cells, where the channels are

displayed in a first dimension of the grid and time is displayed in the second dimension of the grid. An action control glyph is also displayed on the screen. A cell corresponding to one of the channels may be selected and the action control glyph may be activated by a user. In response to the activation of the action control glyph, the method and system "[rotate] the grid of two-dimensional cells so that the one of the displayed plurality of channels is displayed in the second dimension and time is displayed in the first dimension" (independent claims 1 and 15, emphasis added).

The Examiner contends that Lemmons shows all of the features of applicants' independent claims 1 and 15. In particular, the Examiner points to col. 8, ll. 42-57, col. 9, ll. 7-72, and FIG. 3 of Lemmons.

Lemmons is directed to an interactive program guide system that allows a viewer to apply a nonrestrictive sort to program schedule information (col. 3, ll. 28-32). The program schedule information is displayed in a two-dimensional grid of cells, where channels are displayed along the vertical axis and time along the horizontal axis (col. 8, ll. 43-57, FIG. 3). The program guide menu also includes a menu overlay "quickmenu 116," which a user can scroll through using the left and right arrows to select a menu choice

(col. 9, ll. 7-30). The quickmenu includes shortcut choices or "navigation points" ("Hot Picks," "What's On," and "Prime Time") for navigating in the program guide display mode (col. 9, ll. 48-51). A user selection of "a navigation point from the quickmenu 116 simply results in a change in the data displayed in the screen 100 without changing the display mode" (col. 9, ll. 54-56). For example, in response to selecting the "Hot Picks" or "Prime Time" choices from quickmenu 116, data corresponding to the "Hot Picks" or "Prime Time" channels, shown in FIGS. 4 and 5, respectively, is displayed in a two-dimensional grid of cells in which channels are displayed along the vertical axis and time along the horizontal axis. The axes of the grid are the same as the original program guide mode shown in FIG. 3.

Although applicants' claimed invention may generally implicate the subject matter of Lemmons, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 15 patentably improve upon Lemmons by providing a method and system that "[rotates] the grid of two-dimensional cells so that the one of the displayed plurality of channels is displayed in the second dimension and time is displayed in the first dimension" in response to the activation of the action control glyph (emphasis added).

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Lemmons. Claims 2-4, 8-11, 13-14, 16-19, 23-26 and 28-29 which depend from respective independent claims 1 and 15 are also allowable over Lemmons for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Lemmons. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-19, 23-26 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

IV. Applicants' Reply to the § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemmons in view of Lawler. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Applicants' dependent claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, dependent claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 are patentable over Lemmons in view of Lawler for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Lemmons. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-29 are allowable. Therefore, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak

Evelyn C. Mak
Reg. No. 50,492
Attorney for Applicants
Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000
Fax: (212) 596-9090